APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/893,412	06/29/2001	Peter Q. Herman	P/ 3632-5	6026

			EXAMINER
24998	7590	03/08/2004	MANOSKEY, JOSEPH D

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP
2101 L STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20037-1526

ART UNIT	. PAPER NUMBER
2113	3

DATE MAILED: 03/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _29 June 2001_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-13_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _1-13_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _29 June 2001_ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1.   New corrected drawings are required in this application because the drawings

are informal and the conditions of the figures make them difficult to read especially after

they are scanned for publication. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a

competent patent draftsperson outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark

Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to

the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for

corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

3.   The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4.   Claim 8, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as

being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter

which applicant regards as the invention.

5.   Claim 8 recites the limitation "the hierarchy" in line 3. There is insufficient

antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

6.   Claims 10 and 11 recite the limitation "the database" in line 2 of both respective

claims. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claims. Claim

10 and 11 are dependent upon claim 1, which includes two different databases, and

there is insufficient antecedent basis to determine which database is being referenced

in these two limitations.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 1-5 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Elliott, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent 5,214,653, hereinafter referred to as "Elliott" in view of

Sirowitzki et al., U.S. Patent 6,244,174 et al., hereinafter referred to as "Sirowitzki".

9.   Referring to claim 1, Elliott discloses a fault finder expert system includes a data

storage means (See Fig. 1 and Col. 2, lines 40-43). Elliott also discloses the system

containing two databases, a knowledge base, which is interpreted as generic database,

and a LRU database, that includes specific data concerning the operations of the LRU's

of the target system, which is interpreted as a specialized database for user-specific

operations (See Fig. 1 and Col. 3, line 51 to Col. 4, line 5). Elliott discloses the system

having a main control module that provides an interface to a user and the system being

implemented on a personal computer, this is interpreted as an interactive data entry

interface (See Fig. 1, and Col. 3, lines 39-45). Elliott teaches the system including an

expert system shell for processing and displaying conclusions to the user through a

main control module (See Col. 3, lines 46-50). Elliott does not teach the system being a

diagnostic system for a printing press, however Elliott does describe the system in a

generic sense and provides various examples of possible target systems (See Col. 3,

lines 56-59). Sirowitzki discloses a diagnostic system for a printing machine (See Fig.

2, and Col. 3, lines 65-66). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to combine the diagnostic systems of Elliott and Sirowitzki. This

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

do because system determines the necessity of maintenance (See Sirowitzki, Col. 10,

lines 21-26).

10.   Referring to claim 2, Elliott and Sirowitzki disclose all the limitations (See

rejection of claim 1) including the interface including inputs for submitting print jobs.

Sirowitzki teaches the system planning for future printing jobs (See Col. 4, lines 10-11).

11.   Referring to claim 3, Elliott and Sirowitzki disclose all the limitations (See

rejection of claim 2) including capabilities for determining the appearance of the print

jobs. Sirowitzki teaches having information relating to production planning or future

print jobs (See Col. 5, lines 23-27).

12.   Referring to claim 4, Elliott and Sirowitzki disclose all the limitations (See

rejection of claim 1) including the user entering problem symptoms. Elliott teaches the

user entering data including the state of the target system, this is interpreted as the user

entering symptoms of the faults of the system (See Col. 4, lines 31-32).

13.   Referring to claim 5, Elliott and Sirowitzki teach all the limitations (See rejection

of claim 1) including the entering problem classification. Sirowitzki discloses the

classification of problems concerning components of the printing machine (See Col. 7,

lines 51-57).

14.   Referring to claim 10, Elliott and Sirowitzki teach all the limitations (See rejection

of claim 1) including the access to data in the database on components and

subcomponents. Elliott teaches an LRU database that contains definitions of the lowest

replaceable unit of the target systems. Elliott also teaches that LRUs maybe contain

other LRUs, this interpreted as components and subcomponents (See Col. 3, line 61 to

Col. 4, line 5).

15.   Referring to claim 11, Elliott and Sirowitzki disclose all the limitations (See

rejection of claim 1) including a user input for cause and effect information to the

database. Elliott discloses the user verify that a conclusion was correct, thus updating

the information of the cause of the fault (See Col. 2, lines 59-63).

16.   Referring to claim 12, Elliott discloses a fault finder expert system includes a data

storage means (See Fig. 1 and Col. 2, lines 40-43). Elliott discloses the system having

a main control module that provides an interface to a user and the system being

implemented on a personal computer, this is interpreted as an interactive data entry

interface (See Fig. 1, and Col. 3, lines 39-45). Elliott also discloses the system

containing two databases, a knowledge base, which is interpreted as system level

database, and a LRU database, that includes specific data concerning the operations of

the LRU's of the target system, which is interpreted as a user level database for user-

specific operations (See Fig. 1 and Col. 3, line 51 to Col. 4, line 5). Elliott teaches the

user entering data including the state of the target system, this is interpreted as the user

entering symptoms of the faults of the system (See Col. 4, lines 31-32). Elliott does not

teach the system being a diagnostic system for a printing press, however Elliott does

describe the system in a generic sense and provides various examples of possible

target systems (See Col. 3, lines 56-59). Sirowitzki discloses a diagnostic system for a

printing machine (See Fig. 2, and Col. 3, lines 65-66). It would be obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the diagnostic systems of

Elliott and Sirowitzki. This would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention to do because system determines the necessity of

maintenance (See Sirowitzki, Col. 10, lines 21-26).

17.   Referring to claim 13, Elliott discloses a fault finder expert system includes a data

storage means (See Fig. 1 and Col. 2, lines 40-43). Elliott also discloses the system

containing two databases, a knowledge base, and a LRU database, that includes

specific data concerning the operations of the LRU's of the target system (See Fig. 1

and Col. 3, line 51 to Col. 4, line 5). Elliott discloses the system having a main control

module that provides an interface to a user and the system being implemented on a

personal computer, this is interpreted as an interactive data entry interface (See Fig. 1,

and Col. 3, lines 39-45). Elliott discloses the performing an inference process, or

diagnostic session using the user interface (See Col. 4, lines 31-32 and 40-41). Elliott

teaches making a final conclusion, interpreted as a potential solution, from the rules of

the knowledge base (See Col. 39-43). Elliot also discloses updating the database (See

Col. 2, lines 59-65). Elliott does not teach the system being a diagnostic system for a

printing press, however Elliott does describe the system in a generic sense and

provides various examples of possible target systems (See Col. 3, lines 56-59).

Sirowitzki discloses a diagnostic system for a printing machine (See Fig. 2, and Col. 3,

lines 65-66). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the diagnostic systems of Elliott and Sirowitzki. This would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to do because

system determines the necessity of maintenance (See Sirowitzki, Col. 10, lines 21-26).

18.   Claims 6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Elliott and Sirowitzki in view of Rasmussen et al., U.S. Patent 6,608,932, hereinafter

referred to as "Rasmussen".

19.   Referring to claim 6, Elliott and Sirowitzki teach all the limitations (See rejection

of claim 1) except for the indicating print faults using an image-based approach.

Rasmussen discloses diagnosing problems of printers concerning image quality, by

evaluating the image quality (See Col. 2, lines 21-23 and 39). It would be obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the image quality

evaluation of Rasmussen with the diagnosis system of Elliott and Sirowitzki. This would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to do

because image quality analysis can be performed to monitor many aspects of the

printed output of the printing system (See Col. 2, lines 39-42).

20.   Referring to claim 9, Elliott and Sirowitzki teach all the limitations (See rejection

of claim 1) except providing the user with an image of the print fault. Rasmussen

teaches evaluation of image quality of printed output of a printing system (See Col. 2,

lines 39-41). This outputted print, when the printing system has encountered a fault, is

interpreted as providing the user with an image of the print fault. It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the

image of the print fault of Rasmussen with the diagnostic system of Elliott and

Sirowitzki. This would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to do because it allows a user to judge the quality of the image and

determine if a fault has occurred (See Rasmussen, Col. 1, lines 26-30).

21.   Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elliot and

Sirowitzki in view of Shimomura et al., U.S. Patent 5,515,503, hereinafter referred to as

"Shimomura".

22.   Referring to claim 7, Elliot and Sirowitzki disclose all the limitations (See rejection

of claim 1) expect they are silent on the format in which the data related to the print fault

is displayed, specifically to being a hierarchical format. Shimomura teaches cases

system ("CBS") for faults classified hierarchically (See Col. 4, lines 50-56). It would be

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the

displaying of faults of Elliot and Sirowitzki with the CBS hierarchical format of

Shimomura. This would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to do because the CBS allows work to be done more rapidly (See Col. 2, lines

43-47).

23.   Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elliott and

Sirowitzki in view of Spoto et al., U.S. Patent 5,539,869, hereinafter referred to as

"Spoto".

24.   Referring to claim 8, Elliott and Sirowitzki teach all the limitations (See rejection

of 1) except for the diagnostic system comprising inputs for adding links to multimedia

files. Spoto teaches diagnostic system that has diagnostic knowledge and support

information (i.e. drawings and video), which is stored (See Col. 4, lines 1-5). Spoto also

discloses assigning or mapping the multimedia information for each of the diagnostic

nodes, interpreted as linking (See Col. 4, lines 53-63). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the multimedia

links for diagnostic support information of Spoto with the diagnostic system of Elliott and

Sirowitzki. This would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to do because it eliminates the any possible loss of the information at a

later time (See Spoto, Col. 2, lines 33-36).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Joseph Manoskey whose telephone number is (703)

308-5466. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. (8am to 4:30pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on (703) 305-9713. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-

872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JDM
March 3, 2004

ROBERT BEAUSOLIEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100